

REMARKS

Claims 58-64 and 70-76 are pending in the application. In the instant Amendment, claims 58, 71 and 72 have been amended to clarify the invention. Upon entry of the above-made amendments, claims 58-64 and 70-76 will be pending in the application.

Claim 58 has been amended to more clearly describe the presently claimed invention. In particular, claim 58 has been amended by replacing the phrase "deviation of one or more experimental variables from desired values" with the phrase "deviation of one or more experimental variables from conditions under which it is desired to make said measurements." Support for the amendment is found in the specification at page 35, lines 23-32. Claims 71 and 72 have been amended similarly.

No new matter has been added by these amendments. Entry of the foregoing amendments and consideration of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

APPLICANTS' INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank Examiner Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview on April 27, 2004 (hereinafter "the Interview") with Applicants' representatives Adriane M. Antler, Ph.D., and Weining Wang, Ph.D. During the interview, the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Felder et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,232,066 ("Felder"), or, alternatively, based on Felder in view of Singer et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,866,331 ("Singer"), were discussed. Dr. Antler first explained the presently claimed invention. The Examiner suggested that Applicants amend claims 58, 71 and 72 by replacing the phrase "deviation of one or more experimental variables from desired values" with the phrase "deviation of one or more experimental variables from conditions under which it is desired to make said measurements." The Examiner indicated that the amendment would overcome the rejections. Dr. Antler agreed to amend the claims according to the Examiner's suggestion.

THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 58-64 and 70-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner contends that the phrase "deviation